

***Village of Barrington
Plan Commission
Minutes Summary***

Date: January 14, 2003

Time: 7 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Curt Larsen, Vice Chair
Bhagwant Sidhu
Harry Burroughs
Steve Mack
John Rometty
Steve Morrissey

Staff Members: Mr. Keith Sbiral
Sally Lubeno, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Mr. Larsen called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: Anna Bush, Chair, absent; Curt Larsen, Vice Chair, present; Bhagwant Sidhu, present; Harry Burroughs, present; Steve Mack, present; John Rometty, present; Steve Morrissey, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

New Business

Plan Commission 01-03

Mr. Larsen swore in those who would be testifying

The petitioners were Thomas Hayward, of Bell, Boyd, & Lloyd and Robert Best from Barrington Venture Garlands, which was a Continuing Care Facility on the former American Can research property.

Mr. Hayward testified that they first filed on July, 2001, November 26, 2001, and December, 2001 and January 14, 2003. Mr. Hayward provided notification of service of certified mail and regular mail notice on December 10 and Jan 14.

The petitioners were petitioning to amend an existing planned development for the Garlands by downsizing the health center and adding 32 additional units. The petitioners were seeking to eliminate the spine road requirement, to extend use of temporary marking signage, and to amend the comprehensive plan.

Willard Brown, Chairman, Barrington Venture, 137 West Lincoln, Barrington, IL

Mr. Brown stated that in 1996, the petitioners started zoning for project, and it was approved in 1998. The petitioners had exceeded expectations and upgraded when appropriate. The petitioners had arranged for Barrington Arts to perform, also had Performing Arts Center for residents and also dinner shows. The petitioners were opening doors for community. The petitioners had many different amenities such as gift shop, beauty shop, and barbershop, and Harris Bank would soon have a branch there. The petitioners felt it was an economic engine for Barrington. The use was quiet. The petitioners had paid \$162,000 to School District 220 as impact fees. The petitioners had paid \$1.96 million in fees for building permits. The petitioners felt that village staff had been cooperative, and they were appreciative. The petitioners were still fine tuning and still learning.

Ed Gans, Vice President, 503 Naperville, Vice President of Development

Mr. Gans presented current state of Garland PUD, which allowed this development to have 282 independent units, with 256 apartments. There were 60-assisted living units; total density was 422 units. Originally the Health Center had 120 beds planned. The petitioners want to re-examine the numbers of 60 assisted and 60 skilled units and felt they needed to adjust it to 20 assisted units. The petitioners would like to downsize Health Center from 120 to 70 units, and thereby shrink size of footprint. Mr. Gans displayed on an Exhibit: a building of 13,000 square feet and absorb that into the health center.

The petitioners planned a change in the mix of the community to add 32 independent units or 422 total units. There would be a reduction in total number of units to 384.

The petitioners proposed to change the mix and create a new building to house 32 independent living units similar to others with underground parking connected to Health Center and also connected to other buildings. This was shown as new Building F in the exhibit and was proposed for new 32 units. The petitioners have already built 174 independent units. The Health Center was under construction.

Also included in the PUD were traffic signals, entrance to library parking lot and a spine road, that connected Lake Zurich Road to Valencia Road. When spine road was identified, Barrington Country Inn was on the agenda as was Northwest Community Health, and many other developments, which would generate sufficient traffic to justify the road. The petitioners were asking to eliminate obligation to build spine road. There were supposed to be a number of traffic studies done to look at all these developments. These were to take place on an annual basis. The petitioners felt they were no longer required. The petitioners had letters of credit on deposit with the Village. With the dissipation of the other projects along the spine road, the need to build the road also dissipated. If that was the case, the current letters of credit should be reduced. The petitioners needed to put their resources elsewhere. The petitioners felt there should be a significant reduction in the obligation letters of credit has been there for years. The petitioners also planned to take request to Board of Trustees of Barrington.

Since the development began, Pepper Companies had put in a walking jogging path, and the petitioners were asked to connect into that path on the Pepper Property, and they still planned to do that.

The temporary sale signage 8'x12' signs allowed under PUD extended only to May 2001; the petitioners were requesting to extend the use of the current signs to 2005.

The library had talked to their group about screening the signs, and the petitioners were willing to do that even though the screening would have to be done on the library property. The petitioners planned to that this spring.

Joe Carr, Landscaping—111 West Washington Street, Chicago.

Mr. Carr explained what had been done and what was planned for the future would be consistent with what had already been done. The design included planting red maples all along the road with sugar maple shade trees in courtyard. There would be ornamental trees, such as crabapples and June berries along the road and front of building. The shrubs would be spirea, and also perennials that would be consistent with what was there now. There would be pear trees near courtyard and ground cover out to sidewalk. The treatment would continue over to Building F. It would also include roses and princess spirea with grass along the parkways as well. The water retention ponds would have cypress trees. The petitioners planned to save existing trees, for example, a large maple. The petitioners would extend evergreens behind buildings. The petitioners would have wandering garden in back.

The screening behind temporary marking sign would be on US Route 14 with spruce trees along the edge, with three or four large trees on the library side.

Mr. Larsen asked whether the dementia area would be enclosed and how.

Mr. Carr indicated that a wall would enclose it.

Mr. Larsen asked whether shrubs would enclose that as well.

Mr. Carr replied that there would be shrubs on one side and a vine as well.

Mr. Hayward said it does not eliminate the fact that the petitioner would pay for the light and the commitment to pay for half the cost to reconfigure road with US Route 14 and the new road entrance to library.

David Miller, Metro Transportation, 1300 Greenbrook Boulevard, Highland Park.

Mr. Miller expanded on comments on spine road. The original plan was to have only one signal and it would handle all the developments being proposed. As part of that plan, left turns from Lake Zurich Road to US Route 14 would be eliminated. The petitioner now proposed relocating Lake Zurich Road. Focus now would be to move signal from Berry Road, which would give a longer left hand turn into site. Traffic signal as part of library proposal would have access to signal as well. The petitioners still wanted to pursue additional traffic signal at Valencia. The primary focus was the movement of the signal at Berry Road to Lake Zurich Road.

Mr. Larsen asked about park district wishbone road, that entrance went farther to north.

Mr. Hayward said they agreed to putting a T-intersection at Lake Zurich Road.

The petitioners were also in discussion talks with Park District and Village of Barrington. This proposal was the Village's and the Park District's suggestion to make the road safer. The petitioners had seen proposal of Park District, and they were not taking a position on it. The petitioners had a letter of credit. The petitioners would meet previous agreement to share cost of rebuilding road and the cost of light. However, the spine road and the improvement of Lake Zurich Road, the petitioners were asking to be relieved of that responsibility. There was also restriction of movement from the Garlands onto Valencia. As far as movement, the property had right and left turn lanes onto US Route 14. Illinois Department of Transportation would make that decision. It would work for the petitioners the way it was now. Mr. Hayward stated that the reduction of 18 units would make a small reduction in traffic.

Mr. Larsen asked what would be impact of reduction in staffing levels.

The petitioner replied that as they tried to manage overhead, and as they added units, it was easier to change ratio, now it was about .75 per person, and they thought it would be reduced to .6; it would not be a one to one increase; there would be some economies of scale. As a result, there would be a net loss in number of employees.

Mr. Larsen asked about stoplight issues and whether they had applied to the state for a stoplight.

Mr. Hayward stated they applied for movement of light from Barry to Lake Zurich Road. The petitioners also had another application for a light at Valencia that was on file and under review.

Mr. Larson asked Mr. Hayward what were his thoughts to receiving both lights as opposed to receiving one.

Mr. Hayward said he thought the first one, assuming Park District and Village of Barrington agreed on proposal, had a better chance of approval because it served more people.

Mr. Hayward presented the September Plan Commission 01-03 Submittal and asked that the file be presented as part of proceedings, which had all of the narrative, required for the amendments.

Mr. Morrissey asked whether the second light at Valencia was beyond the scope of the original proposal.

Mr. Hayward said not it was in proposal to make it a safer intersection but state liked to minimize. It was not truly necessary but they were following through on their proposal.

Mr. Morrissey asked whether the offsite requirements had an affect on the layouts of the plan.

Mr. Hayward said there was supposed to a 180-foot spine road to connect to Lake Zurich Road, and they were asking for it to be eliminated. All the other developments originally proposed along that road had disappeared.

Mr. Morrissey asked Mr. Miller about usage of park district property as opposed to original health care center.

Mr. Miller said those peak hours might be different. The petitioners were focused on having the traffic signal on US Route 14 that would be a more direct way and safer exit.

Mr. Hayward said that Valencia worked for them because the property had ingress and egress at non-peak hours. The people from Garlands would be leaving at other times.

Mr. Morrissey asked about obligation of traffic studies that were designed because of the original density and since the petitioners were reducing that, he asked about elimination of obligation in total.

Mr. Hayward said his original petition was originally for Valencia. The village said they had received plans for a French Country Inn to be built in conjunction with the Garlands. This was to be a global study to see how all of it would be developed. The Garlands did not need to do that because the areas to north had different uses. The Park District would have to take this issue up with the Village as their plans were still being formulated for their 56-acre site. Mr. Hayward said the next question would be where to place lights.

Mr. Morrissey complimented them on the handsome development.

Mr. Burroughs asked whether the change in building would affect the building phase.

Mr. Hayward said they were right on schedule, and they anticipated completion by end of the year. The change in Building F depended on marketing, and the petitioners were watching balance of sales and would start construction when feasible.

Mrs. Sidhu asked what was planned for the five-acre end piece.

Mr. Hayward said it is still part of Pepper Company property. The Country Inn project was gone and any allocation of land for that site was still part of Pepper Company and was still open space. It now had a running-jogging path through it.

Mr. Larsen asked about changes to underground parking and the storm water.

Mr. Don Matthews said that the project still had underground parking. Before it was one solid mass but now the building had been split and had a shared entrance. There was no impact on the total parking.

Mr. Larsen asked about the parking.

Mr. Matthews said they had a plaza to hide it. With regard to the storm water management, it was still within design. There was an acre because of ponds in north area of campus because of the Inn, which would no longer be using it.

Mr. Larsen asked them to go over the new design and what type of residential units would be included.

Mr. Hayward displayed the health center floor plans. It would have some office retail and a dementia area, which would have to be located on first floor. The second floor would have 8 assisted, 20 skilled and support services, third floor would be all assisted living. Building F was three stories. Marketing information showed 2,600 feet per unit or about ten to a floor, a single loaded corridor, and no unit looked at US Route 14. Everything looked east to courtyard. The height of building was governed by PUD as well.

Mr. Larsen asked about retail.

Mr. Hayward clarified that it was just for on-site use. There was an ice cream and coffee shop; also retail such as a galleria, computer center, bank, and cafeteria.

Mr. Larsen asked about the gray area in the center of the drawing.

Mr. Hayward responded that it was the driveway.

Mr. Larsen asked about a walkway between the two facilities.

Mr. Hayward said that it was enclosed and all connected.

Mr. Larsen asked about the new fitness center and where would the Barrington Council on Aging be located when they moved.

Mr. Hayward said that it was proposed for the first floor in the office area. When it was completed, it would be the Barrington Venture offices and Garlands, which was located right now on Hart road.

Public Comments:

Gene Glendenning, 411 East Valencia, Barrington

Mr. Glendenning stated he represented two-thirds of the members who lived on the street. The neighbors were prepared to present a petition regarding the traffic. Mr. Glendenning said that the material and construction of the project was to be applauded and was as good as could be expected. The new municipal building in combination with this project had been a stress period for them on Valencia as well as Barry Road. Their neighborhood had been a threatened area. A trustee said the petitioners had solved the Valencia problem. He thought it had been a stopgap measure; it had not been a solution. The pattern of traffic had changed because of changes; people adopted it as shortcut. People who were headed to bank or to municipal buildings used speeds were far in excess of ideal residential street traffic.

Mr. Glendenning asked about the importance of light at Valencia. Mr. Glendenning said that the game had changed, and that the intensity of use had changed. Now Lake Zurich Road did not warrant a light. Mr. Glendenning asked about the Jewel Park District. The Village had a park on US Route 14 and it extended on Illinois Route 59 with no traffic lights. There was also a commuter parking lot exit with no stoplights, and also Good Shepherd on Lake-Cook Road without a light.

The original global studies showed there would be impact. Even with restrictive turn on Valencia, there were some people who made the illegal turn. This suggested that a light at Valencia would not work. At Berry Road there was more traffic; children, for example. Kids developed habits and they did not want to expose them to more traffic. Traffic light was for pedestrians.

The neighborhood's obligation was for residents of the village and Valencia, which had changed dramatically. Village plan for Valencia said it was an arterial road. Some times emergency vehicles could not pass. It needed to be changed. There was excessive cut through traffic.

There would be extra property at Pepper Property and Park District for development. Mr. Glendenning also felt that the spine road was out of date for the needs of Garlands and the people of Valencia. But it would not work if there was a light at Valencia. Mr. Glendenning asked whether IDOT would really put a light only 1,000 feet from another light. There should have been a light at the Public Safety Building. The Village of Barrington Police and Fire Departments must blow their sirens to exit the building.

The neighbors had taken some serious hits in their neighborhood with the post office. Village fought to keep this area residential; however, the bank was able to go in there. But there was now a municipal building that would add to the traffic. Mr. Glendenning suggested amending the comprehensive plan to remove Valencia as an arterial road and let the Garlands eliminate the global studies because it was no longer relevant.

Mr. Glendenning asked that nothing be done with the Valencia and US Route 14 and asked that it be eliminated from the Garlands requirements.

Mr. Glendenning also asked that light at Berry remain. Mr. Glendenning thought children had established patterns. Most of them walk to library. Mr. Glendenning thought good planning dissipated traffic.

Terry Jennings, Park District Director 707 Sunnyside, Barrington.

The Park District had been trying to help Garlands through meetings. Through a referendum the Park District inherited an ordinance. Ms. Jennings thought this needed to be reviewed. The Park District have had a meeting with library. The Park District must sell land in order for them to get light. The Park District was very sensitive to issues of the open space. There were many participants: The Garlands, Library, Park District, and Pepper Company. The Park District was a willing participant to make the development happen.

There were some concerns. Since the Park District acquired property to eliminate tax burden, they had encountered environmental issues and an asbestos issues. The Plan Commission was encouraged to help move light. The Park District had spent quite a bit of money. This parcel dissected park into four pieces. The Park District had to help Pepper come into property. The Park District looked at a global plan. Park District was concerned about costs. The Park District agreed with Library to help the petitioners. It was about people who use Lake Zurich Road to enter town. The Park District was a willing party to sell some land which the Library needed to buy and keep open space. The proposed light came as a result of meeting with Garlands and Library and park district. The Park District had to sell land. The Park District needed to make a change with the 640,000 square feet. The density and use would be minimal and would not be greater than it was. Much of original Jewel Tea building would be gone.

As for the Spine Road, there were some exceptions for Garlands. The Park District wanted to help Garlands, and they were sensitive to what happens to Valencia. There was a little concern about trees. The Park District was working with Library to help them get the needed entrance.

Close public comment

Staff Report.

Mr. Sbiral talked about the amendment to comprehensive plan, which would be considered after this case to bring comprehensive plan up to date.

The consensus of the Staff is that Barrington Venture must pursue both traffic signals (Valencia and Lake Zurich Road) for safety considerations as well as to reduce cut-through traffic in surrounding neighborhoods prior to the spine road requirement being eliminated. Staff feels the spine road requirement should be retained temporarily as an alternative to installing signals at Lake Zurich Road and Valencia Avenue as well as ensuring a coordinated plan between Barrington Venture, the Barrington Park District, and the Barrington Area Library.

If Barrington Venture can not achieve approval for both traffic signals on Highway 14, Staff believes the spine road must be installed in some fashion agreeable to all parties. If the spine road is installed and only a single traffic signal is allowed, the traffic signal should be located at Lake Zurich Road, in order to address the safety and cut-through traffic concerns in the surrounding neighborhood.

Regardless of signal location(s), Staff feels final plans must address pedestrian access issues for both the library and the Park District property.

Staff believes that despite new ownership of the Jewel Tea property, very few long term traffic issues with Lake Zurich Road have changed. Staff feels the required traffic studies are vitally important and must be completed. Since the project is not yet built out, and previous studies have not been conducted, traffic studies should extend beyond the original requirements until the completion of construction.

Based on the above findings, staff recommends a conditional approval of the proposed amendments relative to the elimination of future obligations for the spine road (recommendations/conditions are listed above). Staff believes the obligation to construct the spine road and provide corresponding letters of credit should be eliminated only after both the Valencia Avenue and Lake Zurich Road traffic signals are installed. Staff feels it is important to note that care must be taken in the drafting of motions as well as ordinance development to ensure that appropriate previous obligations as well as future obligations not specifically noted in the petition remain unaltered.

Based on the above findings, staff does not support the elimination of the global traffic studies. Staff feels the study dates should be amended to correspond with the revised construction schedule.

Based on the above findings, staff supports the proposed amendment relative to the reconfiguration of the Health Center and Exhibit Center.

Based on the above findings, staff supports the proposed amendment relative to modifying the ordinance relative to the signage removal date of May 1, 2005 provided additional landscaping is installed.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff believes the Plan Commission should hear and analyze the petition as submitted. Following the petitioner presentation, public comment, Staff report, and Commission deliberation, Staff feels the Plan Commission should continue the Public Hearing of PC 01-03 and direct staff to develop amended language for Ordinance Number 98-2729 based on the findings of the Plan Commission deliberations. At the continuation of the Public Hearing Staff will present amended ordinance language for Plan Commission final review.

Mr. Mack asked about why traffic studies had not been undertaken.

Mr. Sbiral asked what Mr. Hayward what was said about their having to put up letters of credit.

Mr. Hayward said it was Section P of Ordinance. The studies were to have been done in September and October of each year.

Mr. Mack said that none of the traffic studies have been started yet there were letters of credit for them.

Mr. Sbiral said the village was to use monies on deposit. It was up to Village to conduct them, and as far as he knew they had not been done.

Mr. Mack said the staff report noted several tentative recommendations in staff report. Mr. Mack concurred with staff opinions.

Mrs. Sidhu concurred with staff report.

Mr. Burroughs asked about keeping two traffic signals.

Mr. Sbiral said that consensus of staff was that both be pursued, and that if both cannot be and that in some other fashion which was appropriate for the spine road.

Mr. Sbiral said the petitioner would be obligated. It was a domino affect. The question was raised whether it would complicate their negotiations with Park District.

Mr. Hayward said he thought he made their presentation and did not agree with staff report. The petitioner did not want the spine road or need it, the village did not need it, and Pepper would not need it. Once spine road was eliminated, approx \$1.8 millions of cost would be eliminated. Times had changed and the petitioners recognized that, and they had the support of neighbors. The petitioners were willing to leave letters of credit for other items.

Mr. Larsen complimented petitioner on revision of existing plans and expansion of assisted living. Mr. Larsen concurred with change of residential community. Mr. Larsen appreciated layout to compliment what was there. Mr. Larsen agreed with extension of the signage and screening. Mr. Larsen did question how many people at the library looked out at the signs. Mr. Larsen did have some concern about retaining the letters of credit but there were three issues: traffic signals, the ultimate configuration to Park District, and what Library was going to do.

Mr. Larsen thought there had been progress, and he encouraged everyone work together to become a really beautiful site at the northeast corner of Barrington in Area one. Mr. Larsen also encouraged staff to work with Library, Park District and Garlands to come to a quick solution to traffic pattern and said that traffic studies that needed to be done should be done and suggested to look at light at Valencia until Garlands had been built. Mr. Larsen thought there should be a traffic study that either supported or negated it. Mr. Larsen said there should be work with traffic light at Berry Road so that the Village could put some closure on this which had been on-going since 1997 and encouraged staff to do whatever is necessary to make it happen.

Mr. Morrissey asked Mr. Larsen if he thought staff recommendation may be amended for obligation to construct spine road.

Mr. Larsen wanted them to work with three parties over next three months to come to a conclusion to a global pattern and come up with the amendments, but under no condition should at a traffic light be constructed until studies supported it.

For a point of information, the question was raised whether that meant what was sent to IDOT would be withdrawn and why pursue something if it was not feasible and take up valuable time of state.

Mr. Hayward added that what happens north of them was not the Garland's concern.

Mr. Larsen said he wanted to bring it together all at one time and conclude this.

Mr. Mack asked whether Mr. Larsen had any changes to amendment.

Mr. Sbiral asked to clarify suggestion whether it was to bring three parties together to Lake Zurich Road intersection and reduction of spine road to north without Valencia light.

Mr. Burroughs asked if the Plan Commission could do a partial approval.

Mr. Morrissey asked when the petition was filed with Illinois Department of Transportation.

Mr. Hayward replied that it was filed in September. Mr. Hayward asked at what point would the Plan Commission hear, as a practical matter, if Village of Barrington and all parties were not in support of them, what if both proposals were turned down. The chair had evidenced frustration, and the petitioner had made commitments and they were following on them. The petitioners were waiting for IDOT to provide their comments.

Mr. Morrissey said his concern was with the State what if now the petitioner had to keep spine road in because State would not put in light at Valencia.

Mr. Larsen said spine road said should be kept in until everything is settled and it should not be considered until the final traffic study was done.

Mr. Morrissey asked what the staff report said in this regard.

Mr. Sbiral said that it tied spine road to both lights.

Mr. Morrissey said he felt there was a problem was with the two lights being tied.

Mrs. Sidhu asked to approve the last three conditions.

Mr. Mack asked to set aside the spine road temporarily recognized value of time. Mr. Mack asked whether it was possible to establish a date certain or a sunset clause.

Mr. Larsen said it should be up to staff and the time when the Plan Commission could have some agreement with Library and Park District regarding the yellow ingress/egress area in the drawing.

Staff had been meeting with Library and Park District.

Terry Jennings said the Park District had met with Library last night. The Park District said it was losing land; it was the encouraging part for Garlands solution. The Library would meet with Park District and address concerns with exceptions, but the Park District needed to cover their cost. This was exactly the point; the Park District had made significant strides for everyone else but not for themselves.

Mr. Mack said there were things beyond your control, and acquisitions, and environmental issues; he said that some things were beyond his site, and they needed a date certain.

Mr. Hayward said they were not walking away from their commitments. However, the petitioners were not part of those other discussions. The Garlands did not care about the light. Mr. Hayward did not know if IDOT would give approval. Mr. Hayward did not even know if they would approve Lake Zurich Road.

Mr. Hayward said there was much to be done with the 56 acres. Park District had many other issues, but what Village and Plan Commission had agreed back in 1998. The Plan Commission could relieve petitioner and park of \$3.2 million obligation. Garlands would keep security deposit. Some things were not appropriate to discuss at the table. Village of Barrington has to deal with Lake Zurich Road as a public road.

Mr. Morrissey suggested April 30, 2003 as a date certain. There would be onus on staff and all other parties to come to some reconciliation for letters of credit.

The Plan Commission was discussing amendment to ordinance to sign, approving modification to Exhibit Center, Building F, requiring future discussion in northern properties between with a sunset clause for releasing obligation for spine road, as well as a global study through the end of construction; and it was village responsibility to conduct it.

Another suggestion for a date certain was January 1, 2004. It was suggested to pull the request for Valencia light. Studies would not have been possible with the construction of route 14. The project would build out by 2006.

MOTION: Mr. Mack moved to approve language as stated. Mr. Morrissey seconded. Roll Call noted the following: Mr. Larsen, yes, Mrs. Sidhu, yes; Mr. Burroughs, yes; Mr. Mack, yes; Steve Morrissey, yes.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting. The Voice Vote noted all ayes. The Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Lubeno, Recording Secretary

Curt Larsen, Vice Chair
Plan Commission